

Peking Scores Soviet Leaders as Pro-U.S.

By Chalmers M. Roberts
Washington Post Staff Writer

Communist China yesterday pointed its finger of scorn directly at the new Soviet leadership, by name, and charged them with "taking united action with the United States on the question of Vietnam."

A lengthy article in People's Daily and Red Flag, as reported from Peking by Reuters and made available in part in Washington, recounted for the first time details of Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin's visit to China last February, just after the United States began bombing North Vietnam.

The article said Kosygin and Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev were "more cunning and hypocritical" than the man they succeeded, Nikita Khrushchev.

The new Soviet leaders were charged with collaborating with the United States in trying to quench "the roaring flames of the Vietnamese people's revolution."

This latest blast at the So-

viet Union came only four days after Dmitriy Polyansky, a top Soviet leader, had declared at the October Revolution ceremony that how Soviet-Chinese relations develop "depends on the Chinese leaders."

The latest Chinese blast, though doubtless in preparation for some time amounts to a total refusal to compromise.

Peking charged the Soviet leaders with "acting in tacit agreement and close collaboration with Lyndon B. Johnson" just as, they said, Khrushchev had done with John F. Kennedy. Peking gave this account:

Last January the United States asked the U.S.S.R. to use its influence to get North Vietnam to accept two conditions — "stop supporting the

See PEKING, A16, Col. 4

France demands U.N. admit Red China by simple majority vote. Page A16.

PEKING—From Page A1

Peking Says Soviets Back U.S. Viet Aims

Vietcong in South Vietnam, and first of all stop supplying it with guns," and "stop the attacks on cities in South Vietnam." Moscow transmitted "these preposterous demands" to Hanoi.

In February, Kosygin, on his way home from Hanoi, stopped in Peking and stressed to the Chinese "the need to help the United States find a way out of Vietnam."

This was firmly rebutted by the Chinese leaders. We (the Chinese) expressed the hope that the new leaders (in Moscow) would support the struggle of the Vietnamese people and not make a deal with the United States . . . Kosygin expressed agreement with our views and stated that they would 'not bargain with others on this issue.' The new leaders . . . soon went back on their promise."

Proposed Conference

The day after Kosygin's return to Moscow, the Kremlin officially "put before (North) Vietnam and China a proposal to convene a new international conference on Indochina without prior conditions, which in fact was advocacy of 'unconditional negotiations' on the Vietnam question."

On Feb. 23, disregarding Hanoi's stand against the proposal and without waiting for Peking's reply, Moscow had its envoy in Paris discuss the idea with President de Gaulle.

After Hanoi rebuffed President Johnson's April 7 offer of "unconditional discussions," Moscow then "began to insinuate that negotiations could be held if only the United States stopped its bombings of North Vietnam."

And "sure enough, not long

afterwards Johnson came out with the maneuver of 'the temporary suspension of bombing'."

"Lackeys of Imperialism"

After these "plots" were foiled, Moscow talked with Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito and India's President Shastri, "both lackeys of U.S. imperialism," but never mentioned "the fact that the crucial point" in "the implementation" of the 1954 Geneva agreements "is the complete withdrawal of the U.S. aggressor troops from Vietnam."

Moscow's purpose, Peking charged, was to bring about peace talks "which could go on indefinitely and also allow the United States to hang on in South Vietnam indefinitely."

Brezhnev and Kosygin, it added, like Khrushchev are "pulling the Vietnam question into the orbit of Soviet-U.S. collaboration."

The Chinese statement also said that the Soviets had spread "the lie" that Peking had obstructed Russian aid shipments to Vietnam. It said that Soviet aid was "far from commensurate with the strength of the Soviet Union," and its purpose was "to gain a say on the Vietnam question and to strike a bargain with U.S. Imperialism on it."

The "new leaders of the Soviet Communist Party" were described as "protagonists of sham unity and real hostility against China."

They were charged with permitting Khrushchev to give an interview advocating peaceful coexistence, with brutally suppressing Asian demonstrators in the Soviet Union, and with fearing "minor trouble" in Vietnam least it "spoil their fond dreams of Soviet-U.S. collaboration."